

REMARKS

In view of the above, claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33-49, and 51-53 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 17, and 52 are the independent claims. Claims 51-53 are new.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 17 stand rejected as either anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Minoru (Japanese Patent Publication No. 2000-294832). Each of the these claims recite a separately manufactured thermal connecting part disposed in said opening and fastened into said mount part. The action points to flat metallic plate 20 as corresponding to this limitation. Action at page 2. We traverse.

We submit that Minoru does not teach or suggest the claimed thermal connecting part. Applicants' specification clearly explains that the thermal connecting part is a part that dissipates heat losses produced by the radiation emitting component. For example, the specification states:

In the case of a component having such a leadframe, the heat losses that are produced during operation are dissipated primarily through the thermal connecting part. ... The thermal connecting part, which is manufactured separately from the rest of the leadframe, in this case has the advantage that it can be considerably better optimized for absorption and dissipation of greater heat loss levels than an integral leadframe. (Specification at page 3, lines 13-25.)

See also, for example, Figures 1A and 1B in the specification, which shows thermal connecting part 4 extending vertically through the mount part to remove heat produced by the LED to the outside of environment. The flat metallic plate 20 in Minoru simply does not provide such heat dissipation.

To the contrary, plate 20 in Minoru is arranged on a thermally insulating substrate (resin substrate 10), and is contained completely within the enclosure supporting LED elements 40. See English Abstract and Figure. Accordingly, plate 20 is not structured to transfer heat produced by LED elements 40 to the outside of frame 11. Specifically, the bottom of resin substrate 20 would efficiently *prevent* a transfer of heat to the outside of the frame because of the generally poor thermal conductivity of resins. Accordingly, we ask the Examiner to withdraw

the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, and 17 based on Minoru because it does not disclosed the claimed “separately manufactured thermal connecting part.”

Note further that new dependent claim 51, which depends from claim 1, further recites “wherein the thermal connecting part extends through the opening in the mount part and connects to the mount part at the opening to transfer heat away from the mount part,” thereby further distinguishing Minoru. For example, as noted above, the metallic plate 20 in Minoru does not “transfer heat away from the mount part.” Nor does it, “extend through the opening in the mount part” or “connect[] to the mount part in the opening,” rather it simply rests within the opening of frame 11.

We submit that all of the remaining claims that stand rejected in view of Minoru are dependent claims and distinguish Minoru for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 30-31, 33-35, 38-40, and 43-46 were rejected as allegedly anticipated by Hochstein (EP 1139439 A1). Without conceding the merits of this rejection, we submit that the rejections is moot because the rejected claims have been amended to depend from claim 1 (through claim 30, which was previously an independent claim).

We ask that the application be allowed.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Georg Bogner et al.
Serial No. : 10/683,712
Filed : October 10, 2003
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 12406-127001 / P2001,0258 US
N

Enclosed is a \$450.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing 12406-127001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/21/05



Marc M. Wefers
Reg. No. 56,842

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21151929.doc